

University of Groningen

The Temporal Structure of State Self-Esteem Variability During Parent-Adolescent Interactions

De Ruiter, Naomi M. P.; Den Hartigh, Ruud J. R.; Cox, Ralf F. A.; Van Geert, Paul L. C.; Kunnen, E. Saskia

Published in:
Self and Identity

DOI:
[10.1080/15298868.2014.994026](https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.994026)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2015

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

De Ruiter, N. M. P., Den Hartigh, R. J. R., Cox, R. F. A., Van Geert, P. L. C., & Kunnen, E. S. (2015). The Temporal Structure of State Self-Esteem Variability During Parent-Adolescent Interactions: More Than Random Fluctuations. *Self and Identity*, 14(3), 314-333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.994026>

Copyright


Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.



The Temporal Structure of State Self-Esteem Variability During Parent–Adolescent Interactions: More Than Random Fluctuations

Naomi M. P. De Ruiter, Ruud J. R. Den Hartigh, Ralf F. A. Cox, Paul L. C. Van Geert & E. Saskia Kunnen

To cite this article: Naomi M. P. De Ruiter, Ruud J. R. Den Hartigh, Ralf F. A. Cox, Paul L. C. Van Geert & E. Saskia Kunnen (2015) The Temporal Structure of State Self-Esteem Variability During Parent–Adolescent Interactions: More Than Random Fluctuations, *Self and Identity*, 14:3, 314-333, DOI: [10.1080/15298868.2014.994026](https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.994026)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.994026>



Published online: 22 Dec 2014.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 301



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 5 View citing articles [↗](#)

The Temporal Structure of State Self-Esteem Variability During Parent–Adolescent Interactions: More Than Random Fluctuations

Naomi M. P. De Ruiter, Ruud J. R. Den Hartigh, Ralf F. A. Cox,
Paul L. C. Van Geert, and E. Saskia Kunnen

Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, 9712 TS Groningen,
The Netherlands

Research regarding the variability of state self-esteem (SSE) commonly focuses on the *magnitude* of variability. In this article we provide the first empirical test of the *temporal structure* of SSE as a real-time process during parent–adolescent interactions. We adopt a qualitative phenomenological approach, whereby moment-to-moment emotional and behavioral indicators of SSE are measured as they emerged during the interactions, resulting in SSE time series. We conducted detrended fluctuation analyses (DFA) on the SSE time series and found that they exhibited a form of structured variability, called *pink noise*. The mean DFA exponent differed significantly from that of randomized surrogate data ($p < .01$), which revealed uncorrelated random variability, called *white noise*. This finding shows that the temporal structure of SSE variability exhibits self-similarity and is not random. In addition, a weak positive relationship was found between the DFA and context-independent autonomy levels.

Keywords: Detrended fluctuation analysis; Temporal dynamics; Self-esteem; Dyadic interaction; Dynamic systems.

Self-esteem is conceptualized as having both a trait element (characterized as relatively stable and predictable across time) and a state element (characterized by fluctuations from moment to moment and a high level of variability) (Donnellan, Kenny, Trzesniewski, Lucas, & Conger, 2012). While the number of theoretical and empirical studies focusing on state self-esteem (SSE) is increasingly growing, these studies tend to focus on the magnitude of SSE variability (e.g., Leary & Downs, 1995). To date, very little theoretical or empirical research has been done concerning the nature of the moment-to-moment fluctuations that occur in SSE, which we refer to as the *temporal structure* of SSE variability.

This article provides the first test of the temporal structure of SSE as a moment-to-moment (i.e., real-time) process. We begin by exploring the implicit assumptions held regarding SSE variability and its temporal structure, and showing how these assumptions may be at the root of why the temporal structure of SSE variability has remained outside of the limelight. Next, we suggest that the temporal structure of SSE exhibits more meaningful dynamics than is commonly attributed to it, and more specifically, that SSE

Received 20 June 2014; accepted 28 November 2014; first published online 22 December 2014.

Correspondence should be addressed to: Naomi M. P. de Ruiter, Grote Kruisstraat 1/2, 9712 TS Groningen, The Netherlands. Email: n.m.p.de.ruiter-wilcox@rug.nl

can be conceptualized as a process that exhibits *fractal* characteristics. We test whether this is indeed the case for adolescents during parent–adolescent interactions, and we explore how the temporal structure of SSE is related to a pivotal indicator of healthy adolescent development, namely, autonomy.

Implicit Assumptions Regarding the Temporal Structure of SSE Variability

The common conceptualization of SSE stems from the notion that SSE is the “barometric” element of self-esteem, which is variable across time and contexts and fluctuates around the relatively stable “baseline” level of self-esteem. This conceptualization is consistent with the basic axiom of standard psychometric theory, which posits that there is a true underlying level of a latent variable, and that this true level is expressed by a score (measured by an instrument) that is subject to error. Therefore, the observed score is equal to the true score plus error, where the error is by definition independent from the true score (Lord & Novick, 1968; Van Geert & Van Dijk, 2002). For self-esteem specifically, SSE is commonly approached as the “error” around (and independent from)—what is thought to be—a more meaningful baseline level that is trait self-esteem, where the “error” is a contextually based error. Indeed, according to a prevailing theory in self-esteem research—the Sociometer Theory (Leary et al., 1995)—trait self-esteem is viewed as the resting level of self-esteem in the absence of contextual information, and SSE is thought to fluctuate around this resting level of self-esteem as a function of social cues in the immediate context (Leary, 1999). Therefore, the underlying assumption is that, without the presence of contextual events, SSE is expected to be equal to the baseline level of trait self-esteem.

Empirical research has primarily approached SSE *variability* as a function of external factors, as a reaction to the immediate context. Studies therefore often focus on the magnitude of the reaction to external cues, either by measuring the test-retest level of SSE before and after an experimental contextual cue (e.g., Heatherton & Polivy, 1991; Leary & Downs, 1995; Murray, Griffin, Rose, & Bellavia, 2003; Thomaes et al., 2010), or by measuring between-individual differences in the level of *self-esteem stability* (Kernis, Cornell, Sun, Berry, & Harlow, 1993; Kernis, Grannemann, & Barclay, 1989), conceptualized as a dispositional quality of how reactive an individual is to daily events (e.g., Franck & De Raedt, 2007; Jordan, Whitfield, & Zeigler-Hill, 2007; Kernis et al., 1989; Koole, Dijksterhuis, & Van Knippenberg, 2001; Oosterwegel, Field, Hart, & Anderson, 2001; Savin-Williams & Demo, 1983).

Regarding the temporal *structure* of SSE variability, self-esteem researchers who build upon the above assumptions have yet to explicitly describe—theoretically or empirically—what the temporal nature of SSE dynamics is. Generally speaking, however, the standard psychometric theory that underlies the baseline approach (see above) indicates that the variability around the true score is symmetrically distributed, due to the fact that the variability is assumed to be the cause of independent and randomly varying contextual factors (Van Geert & Van Dijk, 2002). Following this basic theory, SSE represents a short-lived experience, which—given the absence of a new contextual cue—will return back to the baseline level (Alessandri & Caprara, 2012). Given this conceptualization, the variability of SSE should resemble *white noise* (Diniz et al., 2011; Gilden, 2001; Stadnitski, 2012; Van Orden, Holden, & Turvey, 2003, 2005), which is temporally random variability that is created when there is no carry-over effect from one state to the next (see Figure 1(a)).

This implicit assumption is directly implied by the common methodological approaches to repeated measures of SSE, which focus on central tendencies of self-esteem




FIGURE 1 Three simulated types of noise patterns: White noise (a), pink noise (b), and Brown noise (c).

(i.e., measures at the aggregate level). First, repeated measures are often averaged in order to gain a measure of the true level of self-esteem (i.e., of trait self-esteem) (DeHart & Pelham, 2007); a technique that depends on the assumption that there is a meaningful average level that SSE fluctuates around. Second, repeated measures are often utilized in order to determine the standard deviation (SD) of SSE (i.e., self-esteem stability, see above), which implies that the noise (i.e., variability) around the baseline level produces a temporally stable level of variability (DiDonato, England, Martin, & Amazeen, 2013; Van Orden et al., 2003). Together, these methodological approaches imply that SSE is a stationary signal with a constant mean and SD, i.e., central characteristics of white noise.

SSE Variability as a Fractal Process

We question the assumption that SSE variability is purely a function of exogenous events, as well as the assumption that the temporal structure of the resulting variability is random (i.e., white noise). Alternatively, we posit that each SSE event is in itself a process, and that this process interacts with neighboring (i.e., future) SSE processes. These dynamics are defined as *interaction-dominant* dynamics, where the coordination of the process at large is a function of the internal dynamics, which occur within a context, but which are not a function of the context alone (Van Orden et al., 2003). From this conceptualization, SSE exhibits both short-term and long-term carry-over effects. We suggest, therefore, that SSE is a self-coordinating process, rather than a passively reactive (i.e., stimulus-response like) and random process.

Many human processes that have recently been conceptualized as depending on interaction-dominant dynamics have been found to exhibit *pink noise* (see Figure 1(b)),¹ which is structured variability characterized by correlated activity across many time scales (Van Orden et al., 2003; Wijnants, Cox, Hasselman, Bosman, & Van Orden, 2012). Pink noise is significant for a number of reasons. First, it is indicative of a fractal process. Fractals are characterized by their self-similarity, which can refer to spatial or temporal self-similarity. Spatial fractals occur “when the same object replicates itself on

successively smaller scales” (Segev, Soljačić, & Dudley, 2012, p. 209), which is (statistically) true for many geometrical objects in nature, such as the Romanesco broccoli. This article concerns temporal fractals, where variability is statistically similar across multiple time scales (seconds, minutes, etc.). Any point in a fractal process, therefore, possesses the “dynamic memory” of all preceding points of the process and is therefore embedded in the historical context of the system (Delignières, Fortes, & Ninot, 2004; Diniz et al., 2011). The presence of pink noise is also significant in that it indicates a balance between order and chaos (Wijnants, 2014), which characterizes healthy and well-coordinated systems (Herman, Giladi, Gurevich, & Hausdorff, 2005; Wijnants, Hasselman, Cox, Bosman, & Van Orden, 2012). Indeed, pink noise lies on a continuum between *white noise* and *Brown noise* (see Figure 1), which we will describe below.

White noise is random and temporally uncorrelated noise distributed symmetrically around an average level (Figure 1(a)), referred to above regarding the traditional “barometer” view of SSE. White noise is considered maladaptive because it reflects excessive flexibility to the extent that the system is unstable and does not demonstrate any memory of the previous state (Hausdorff, 2009). Processes approaching white noise have indeed been found to indicate abnormalities; for example, the temporal variability in trial-by-trial word-naming tasks in young dyslexic readers (compared to non-dyslexic readers) (Wijnants et al., 2012). At the other end of the spectrum, Brown noise is highly rigid and overly determined, such that the next state of a process is equal to the previous state plus a random influence (Figure 1(c)). Brown noise is considered unhealthy because it indicates that the system does not adapt effectively to the current context and is therefore “stuck” in the previous meaningful state (Gilden & Hancock, 2007). Processes approaching Brown noise have indeed been found to indicate abnormalities; for example, the temporal variability of reaction times of a mental rotation task in adults with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) (compared to individuals without ADHD) (Gilden & Hancock, 2007).

While the fractal properties of SSE across real time have not been examined to date, there is an abundance of evidence that real-time cognitive and motor processes reveal pink noise (for a review, see Wijnants, 2014). Moreover, there is rising evidence that pink noise is also displayed in socio-emotional processes, such as trial-by-trial reaction times in racial-bias tasks (Correll, 2008), short conversational storytelling sessions (Butner, Pasupathi, & Vallejos, 2008), and mood across the long term (from 1 to 2.5 years) (Gottschalk, Bauer, & Peter, 1995). Closely related to self-esteem, Vallacher and colleagues have shown that verbal self-reflection (regarding trait-like properties) expresses interaction-dominant dynamics, where self-reflection converges onto relatively coherent regions of positivity or negativity (Vallacher, Nowak, Froehlich, & Rockloff, 2002) and exhibits pink noise (Wong, Vallacher, & Nowak, 2014). Finally, Ninot and colleagues (Fortes, Delignières, & Ninot, 2004; Ninot, Fortes, & Delignières, 2005) measured SSE as a long-term process (i.e., approximately a year and a half), where the smallest time interval between successive SSE measurements was approximately 12 h. While Ninot and colleagues did not examine *real-time* variability of SSE, they showed that the dynamics of SSE are a function of intrinsic dynamics (described by a moving-average model), and that SSE exhibits pink noise (Delignières et al., 2004).

The above findings regarding self-evaluation processes as characterized as interaction dominant, and as exhibiting pink noise, support our hypothesis that the real-time process of SSE will demonstrate pink noise. Given that SSE fluctuations are conceptualized as occurring in the here-and-now (e.g., Kernis et al., 1993, 1989; Leary & Downs, 1995; Rosenberg, 1986), it is important that the temporal structure of SSE is also investigated across real time, as is done in this study.

A Qualitative Phenomenological Account of SSE

To date, researchers interested in variability of SSE have used the *experience sampling method* (e.g., Delignières et al., 2004; Oosterwegel et al., 2001). While this method is highly suitable for capturing daily fluctuations of SSE, it is not ideal for capturing SSE as a real-time process (with fluctuations occurring from moment to moment). This is because the very act of reporting on the momentary self-experience of one's self would disrupt the organic process of SSE and would not capture the *continuous* SSE process. To remedy this, we suggest that it is helpful to collect qualitative data that are phenomenological by nature, based on naturally emerging positive and negative self-experiences.

First, in order to tap into the phenomenological experience of SSE, it is important that SSE is considered in a context involving interaction with a significant others (Ryan & Brown, 2003; Scheff & Fearon, 2004). Such a context provides a practical way to elicit relevant processes (Gable, Gosnell, & Prok, 2012), as individuals are most likely to express self-experiences in a natural manner in the context of interaction (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006). It is also theoretically important to study self-esteem in the context of interaction with significant others, as significant others play an important role in the way that self-esteem emerges into a structured state (Fogel, 1993; Tangney & Fischer, 1995). Indirect support for this has been found, where explicit SSE is affected by one's perception of their relationship with significant others (Bulanda & Majumdar, 2008) and by the individual's perception of being accepted by and connected with others (Denissen, Penke, Schmitt, & Van Aken, 2008; Heppner et al., 2008; Murray et al., 2003; Thomaes et al., 2010).

Second, regarding the positive and negative self-experiences that are measured, cognitions of self-evaluation are traditionally measured as characteristics of (both state and trait) self-esteem. However, when investigating the phenomenological experience of self-esteem, it is important that researchers move toward a more holistic approach, where emotions and behavior are considered (Ryan & Brown, 2003; Scheff & Fearon, 2004). For SSE specifically, it is even more imperative that cognitions are not relied upon as the sole source of information, as it is likely that self-evaluation will first occur without conscious monitoring, and therefore, not as cognitions (Cunningham & Zelazo, 2007; Ryan & Brown, 2003).

Alternatively, we focus on the positivity and negativity of *behavioral* and *affective* experiences of the self. These self-experiences can be conceptualized as lower order components of SSE that, by means of intrinsic dynamics, emerge into a higher order experience of the self, i.e., SSE, where all lower order components are conceptualized as having equal weight in the process of emergence. SSE is therefore the general level of positivity or negativity regarding the self at that moment, and the separate emotional and behavioral experiences of the self are indicators of that general level.

The reason for including behavioral indicators of SSE is that behavior reflects how an individual sees or feels about him or herself (Atkinson, 1964; Leary, 2004). For self-esteem, the positivity or negativity of the behavioral experience of the self is reflected in autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1995), where real-time expressions of autonomy are thus relevant for real-time self-esteem (i.e., SSE). According to the Self-Determination Theory (SDT), autonomous actions are manifestations of a secure sense of self and a high level of true self-esteem, and self-worth is reflected in agency and proactivity (Deci & Ryan, 1995). In our study, autonomous actions need not indicate separation and individuation from the parent (Kroger, 1998), as is often adopted when considering autonomy. Instead, in accordance with the SDT, autonomous actions are those that express agency, proactivity, free-will, and ownership of behavior.

We included emotions as an indicator of SSE as emotions reflect an individual's personal reality regarding their self-worth (Cognitive-Experiential Self Theory; Epstein, 1993). Specifically, "self-conscious" emotions are of relevance to SSE, which are socially situated emotions pertaining to the self, such as pride and shame (Tangney & Fischer, 1995). These are in contrast with emotions that are not self-conscious, such as affection or anger (which reflect appraisals of the context and concerns in an immediate relationship, Frijda, 2001).

When considering the phenomenological experience of SSE, it is necessary to distinguish between those expressions of positive SSE that are genuine, and those that are not. This perspective stems from the SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1995), where "genuine" high self-esteem is the result of *self-determined* actions, i.e., acting in accordance with one's own interests and values, rather than trying to gain self- or other-regard (Ryan & Brown, 2003). Researchers have suggested that positive self-esteem expressions are not genuine when an individual misrepresents his or her self-feeling (i.e., a discrepancy between privately experienced self-feelings and expressed self-feelings), and that positive self-esteem expressions are genuine when an individual represents his or her self-feelings in a honest way (i.e., no discrepancy between privately experienced self-feelings and expressed self-feelings) (Kernis & Paradise, 2002).

In this study, we incorporate this distinction [and its identification according to Kernis and Paradise (2002)] into our measurement of SSE. This is done by conceptualizing *positive* SSE as expressions of positive self-experience that do *not* entail or coincide with a discrepancy of valence between simultaneously expressed emotions or autonomous behavior. Discrepancies of valence occur when one experience is positive by nature and the other (simultaneously expressed experience) is negative by nature (e.g., verbally expressing pride while non-verbally expressing embarrassment). Moreover, discrepancies include both experiences of the *self* as well as experiences of the *significant other* with which the individual is interacting. It is important that discrepancies regarding experiences of the significant other are also included, as one can only experience genuine self-esteem if one is not simultaneously being "fake" in immediate relationships with significant others (Kernis, 2003).

The Current Study

Our study provides the first account of a qualitative phenomenological approach to SSE across real time, where positive and negative emotional and behavioral self-experiences that are expressed during interaction with a significant other are observed. We aim to investigate the temporal structure of SSE variability as a real-time process. This study focuses specifically on adolescents, as adolescence is a significant period for self-esteem development (Harter & Whitesell, 2003; Robins, Trzesniewski, Tracy, Gosling, & Potter, 2002). We hypothesize that the temporal structure of SSE variability will be structured, rather than random, thereby resulting in long-range correlations as indicated by the presence of pink noise (Hypothesis 1).

Moreover, we examine the relationship between the temporal structure of adolescents' SSE variability and the static (i.e., non-temporal) and self-reported levels of adolescent trait and SSE. This is useful in order to ascertain how the temporal measure of structure relates to the more traditional measures of self-esteem levels. We hypothesize that the temporal *structure* of SSE is a distinct concept from the *level* of self-esteem. We therefore expect there to be no significant correlations between the temporal structure of SSE and the static measures of self-esteem levels (Hypothesis 2).

Finally, we examine the relationship between the temporal structure of adolescents' SSE variability and a theoretically relevant psychological variable during adolescence, so that the meaning of the temporal structure can be grounded in psychological theory related to adolescence. We examine the association with adolescents' levels of self-reported context-independent autonomy, as this is an indicator of positive psychosocial adjustment during adolescence² (Noom, Dekovic, & Meeus, 1999). Considering that—first—higher autonomy levels indicate healthy adjustment in adolescents (Noom et al., 1999), and that—second—fractal characteristics indicate healthy human processes (Herman et al., 2005), we hypothesize that fractal characteristics in adolescent SSE and autonomy levels of adolescents will be positively related (Hypothesis 3).

Method

Participants

Participants were 13 adolescents (3 boys, 10 girls) and their parents (1 male, 12 females). The mean adolescent age was 13.30 years ($SD = 0.90$). The parent–adolescent dyads that took part in this research responded to recruitment flyers that were handed out in various local community centers and schools. The participants had no indication of clinical diagnoses and were of average socioeconomic status. The majority of the dyads were Dutch, with one American–Dutch dyad and one British dyad. Participation was voluntary, and children were rewarded after the video recordings took place with a 5 Euro gift voucher.

Procedure

Before the video recordings took place, adolescents filled out a questionnaire regarding their trait self-esteem and their autonomy. Later, each dyad was video recorded in their home environment during a semi-naturalistic interaction by the first author. The dyads were given three consecutive topics to discuss. The nature of each topic was such that the parent and child would try to come to a mutual agreement. The first discussion topic was neutral (for example: If you could have one super power, which would you have?). The second was a conflict topic relevant to each dyad at that moment (for example: cleaning up your room). The last discussion topic was a new neutral topic comparable to the first (i.e., A–B–A design, Granic, Hollenstein, Dishion, & Patterson, 2003). In assigning both neutral and conflict topics, a range of emotions and behavior were potentially elicited (Granic et al., 2003). Dyads were told that they could move on to the next topic when they felt they were finished with the previous one, keeping in mind that they should take about 5 min for each topic. Dyads were also assured that there are no “right” or “wrong” things to say or do, and that we (the researchers) are simply interested in their natural responses to each other. The dyads were given no further instructions and were left alone in a room of their choice for the duration of the video-recorded interaction. After the filming was finished, the participants were asked to immediately fill in a self-report measure of SSE. The observational videos were subsequently coded.

Coding Procedure

Based on the video-recorded interactions, theoretically important emotional (Epstein & Morling, 1995; Scheff & Fearon, 2004; Stipek, Recchia, McClintic, & Lewis, 1992) and behavioral (Allen, Hauser, Bell, & O'Connor, 1994; Deci & Ryan, 1991; Noom, Dekovic,

& Meeus, 2001) measures were collected that, together, indicate the participants' phenomenological SSE (see Section Measures, below).

Coding of emotions was largely based on the SPAFF coding system (Coan & Gottman, 2007). Adaptions were made in order to distinguish between self-directed affect and other-directed affect, and were data-driven (in accordance with the Grounded Theory; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Coding of behavior was largely based on Noom et al.'s (2001) framework of emotional, functional, and cognitive autonomy during adolescence, in combination with Savin-Williams and Jaquish's behavior checklist for self-esteem (Savin-Williams & Jaquish, 1981).

Coding was done in the program The Observer XT 10.5. Each utterance and action observed in the video-recorded interaction was coded, based on a combination of the adolescents' facial expressions, body posture, intonation, and verbalizations.

Coders were extensively trained until 75% agreement between the trainee and the trainer was reached based on the unaggregated time series for each measure. Average between-observer reliability based on explained variance between the two time series was $R^2 = .79$ for behavior and $R^2 = .81$ for affect.

Measures

Phenomenological SSE Indicators

The following measures were obtained by means of coding:

Self-affect is self-directed affect. Both positive self-affect and negative self-affect were scored. Positive self-affect was scored on a scale of 0–3, which includes 0 = neutral; 1 = self-interest (e.g., adolescent speaks enthusiastically about an idea she/he has); 2 = humor (e.g., adolescent laughs in self-assured manner while speaking/behaving); 3 = pride (e.g., adolescent complements himself/herself). Negative self-affect was scored on a scale of 0 to –3, which includes 0 = neutral; –1 = embarrassment (e.g., adolescent speaks with eyes cast down); –2 = anxiety (e.g., adolescent fidgets and avoids eye contact while opposing parent); –3 = shame (e.g., adolescent speaks in sad and serious tone during self-invalidation). Conflicting self-affect could be coded (i.e., simultaneous positive and negative scores) when verbal and nonverbal expressions of self-affect conflicted, for example, if an individual verbally expressed positive self-affect by complementing himself (e.g., "I'm always right") while nonverbally expressing embarrassment (i.e., looking downwards and speaking in a soft voice). Positive or negative *self-affect* could be distinguished from positive or negative emotional experiences of the parent or the general interaction based on the timing of the action or utterance. For example, if a child said something and then smiled directly afterwards, this was coded as self-affect because it is clear that the smile is directly related to something that the *child* said/did. If, on the other hand, the child smiled after the *parent* said something, this was not coded as positive self-affect.

Autonomy was scored on an ordinal scale of –2 to 3,³ where –2 = submission (e.g., adolescent changes opinion in accordance with what parent thinks without being offered counter arguments); –1 = attitudinal heteronomy (e.g., adolescent expresses not knowing the answer to a question that does not require specific knowledge); 0 = neutral; 1 = attitudinal autonomy (e.g., adolescent contributes an idea); 2 = agency (e.g., adolescent initiates a change in discussion topic); 3 = self-assertion/confrontation (e.g., adolescent rejects accusation made by the parent).

Internal Dissonance was scored after coding took place for each moment during the interaction that was coded. Internal Dissonance is taken into consideration in the calculation of SSE, alongside Self-affect and Autonomy (see SSE calculation, below) in

order to ensure that expressions of positive SSE are genuine (Kernis, 2003; Ryan & Brown, 2003). Internal Dissonance was scored on a scale of 0–3, and is equal to the sum of instances at t_x in which self-experiences contradict themselves (based on the coded measures above), and in which other-directed affect contradicts itself. In order to determine whether other-directed affect contradicts itself, positive and negative measures of *Connectedness* were included as a third observational measure (see below). In Table 1 the three possible instances of Internal Dissonance at t_x are outlined, based on the rationale outlined by Kernis (2003).

Connectedness is the other-directed affect, which was scored for the adolescent during or directly following the *parent's* utterance or action. Both positive and negative connectedness were scored. Positive connectedness was scored on a scale of 0–3, which includes 0 = neutral; 1 = other-interest (e.g., adolescent smiles while parent speaks); 2 = other-joy (e.g., adolescent laughs while/after parent speaks/acts); 3 = affection (e.g., adolescent hugs parent). Negative connectedness was scored on a scale of 0 to –3, where 0 = neutral; –1 = other-disinterest (e.g., adolescent looks away and turns body away while parent speaks); –2 = other-frustration (e.g., adolescent responds to parent with whining tone); –3 = contempt (e.g., adolescent expresses hurtful comment in a sarcastic tone). Positive and negative connectedness could be simultaneously scored if verbal and nonverbal expressions conflicted. An example of this is if an adolescent verbally expresses connectedness by laughing when the parent tells a joke, while expressing a hurtful comment in a sarcastic tone.

Self-Report Self-Esteem Measures

Self-report SSE was collected as a static score of the individuals' SSE directly after the video-recorded interaction took place. After reading the question "How do you feel at this moment", adolescents were asked to answer by responding to the statement "In general I like myself". The degree to which the adolescent agreed with this statement was indicated by marking an X on a horizontal line where 0.0 = "I disagree" and 8.5 = "I agree" (see Ninot, Fortes, & Delignières, 2001).

Self-report trait self-esteem was measured (before the video-recorded interaction took place) using the Rosenberg (1979) self-esteem scale, including 10 questions regarding individuals' feelings toward themselves in general (e.g., "I take a positive attitude toward myself"). Trait self-esteem was measured on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 = very true; 5 = not at all true).

Self-report autonomy was measured (before the video-recorded interaction took place) using a questionnaire that measured three categories of subjective and context-independent autonomy: attitudinal autonomy (one's ability to make decisions, and define opinions and goals), emotional autonomy (a feeling of confidence in one's own choices and goals), and functional autonomy (the ability to develop a strategy to achieve one's

TABLE 1 Possible Instances of Internal Dissonance

Mismatch of simultaneous codes	Theoretical rationale
Positive self-affect and negative self-affect	Lack of trust in internal processes
Positive connectedness and negative connectedness	Not being genuine in relationships
Negative autonomy and positive self-affect	Dissonance between behavioral expression and internal processes

Note: The internal-dissonance score is a sum of the number of instances of internal dissonance simultaneously present at t_x .

goals; Noom et al., 2001). The three categories of autonomy were measured on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 = never true; 5 = almost always true). The general level of autonomy is equal to the average of the three categories.

Analysis

SSE Calculation

State self-esteem (SSE_t) was calculated as the sum of the behavioral and affective expressions of self-experience at t_x (i.e., autonomy and self-affect) on an ordinal scale of -5 to 6 . SSE was calculated for every second of the interaction. When no scores were given for either self-affect or autonomy, $SSE_t = 0$ (i.e., neutral). This was the case for moments in which the adolescents did not say or do anything. A positive SSE_t score was only given if the simultaneous score for Internal Dissonance was 0 . This is in accordance with our focus on *genuine* expressions of positive SSE. The calculation for SSE_t was conducted in Microsoft Excel (version 2010), and is described by the following formula (1):

$$SSE_t = (SA_t + AU_t); \text{ if } (SA_t + AU_t > 0) \text{ and } (ID_t = 0); \text{ otherwise,} \\ 0 \quad (1)$$

where SA_t is self-affect, AU_t is autonomy, and ID_t is internal dissonance at t_x .

The additive model reflects the dynamic nature of self-experience, as well as our conceptualization that autonomous and emotional self-experiences carry equal weight in the emergence of SSE.

Hypothesis 1:

Analysis of Temporal Structure of SSE

Detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA; Peng, Havlin, Stanley, & Goldberger, 1995) was applied to each SSE time series. This technique is especially useful for testing the temporal structure of variability when time series are non-stationary and/or relatively short (< 1024 data points). In our sample, the length of the time series ranged from 487 data points to 1708 data points.

The DFA reveals a relationship between different window sizes of data and the average fluctuation of the windowed data. More specifically, SSE time series were divided into non-overlapping windows of equal length. The best fitting trend line was then determined, and the root mean square residual (average fluctuation) was calculated. This was repeatedly done for windows of different sizes (from 4 data points to one-fourth of the length of the entire time series). This means that for each time scale (i.e., window size), the average fluctuation was determined. By examining the relationship between window sizes and their respective level of fluctuations, the temporal structure of the fluctuations can be determined. This relationship (the average fluctuation against increasing window sizes) can be plotted on a log-log plot, whereby the slope indicates a DFA exponent. A DFA of 0.5 reflects Gaussian white noise (i.e., a highly random structure), a DFA of 1.5 reflects Brown noise (i.e., a highly rigid structure), and a DFA of 1.0 reflects pink noise (i.e., long-range correlations and fractal scaling; Hasselman, 2013; Wijnants et al., 2012).

To statistically test whether the empirical SSE time series are characterized by a fractal structure rather than by a random structure, we tested whether the DFA dimensions obtained from the original SSE time series were significantly different from the DFA dimensions obtained from surrogate time series that function as a control group (Hausdorff, Peng, Ladin, Wei, & Goldberger, 1995), using a paired-sample t -test. The surrogate time series were created by shuffling the order of data points within each observed SSE time series (i.e.,

within individuals) with a random permutation. A new time series is thus created that contains the same data points, but in a random order. The shuffled time series therefore have the same mean and SD as the observed time series, but there is no carry-over effect from one moment to the next, simulating SSE variability that is likely to exhibit white noise.

Hypothesis 2:

Association Between Temporal Structure of SSE and Self-Reported Self-Esteem Measures

To explore the relationship between the temporal structure of SSE variability and the traditional measures of SSE level, we calculated the Pearson correlation between DFA and self-reported SSE and trait self-esteem.

Hypothesis 3:

Association Between Temporal Structure of SSE and Context-Independent Autonomy

To explore the relationship between the temporal structure of SSE variability and the adolescents' context-independent autonomy levels, we calculated the Pearson correlation between DFA and autonomy (on average as well as for the three categories of autonomy separately).

Results

Analysis of Temporal Structure of SSE

The average SSE level across all individuals was $M = 0.49$ ($SD = 0.98$), based on all seconds in the time series. The length of the time series was $M = 911.46$ s ($SD = 322.67$). Figure 2 below shows a representative example of a SSE time series.

Figure 3 shows a log–log plot of the relationship between the log of the average fluctuation (Q) and the log of the window size (points in subset). The straight line indicates that there is a linear relationship, such that fluctuations in smaller windows are related to fluctuations in larger windows in a power-law fashion. The slope of the line indicates the scaling exponent, i.e., $DFA = 0.89$.

On average, the DFA exponent of the empirical SSE time series was $M = 0.81$ ($SD = 0.05$). The lowest DFA score was 0.74, while the highest was 0.90. The temporal structure of SSE variability is therefore close to pink noise, i.e., $DFA \sim 1.0$. The DFA values were weakly correlated with the SDs of the SSE time series ($r = .14$), indicating




FIGURE 2 Example of a SSE time series based on the empirical data.




FIGURE 3 Example of a log–log plot of average fluctuation (Q) versus window size (points in subset) based on the empirical data. Slope (DFA exponent) = 0.89.




FIGURE 4 Example of a SSE time series based on the shuffled data.

that the nature of the temporal variability of SSE (i.e., DFA) is distinct from the magnitude of variability of SSE (i.e., SD).

The average DFA exponent for the participants’ shuffled SSE time series was $M = 0.49$ ($SD = 0.03$), indicating uncorrelated randomness very close to white noise, i.e., $DFA \sim 0.5$ (see Figure 4 for an example of a shuffled SSE time series).

The mean DFA scores of SSE for the empirical (non-shuffled) time series and the surrogate (shuffled) time series are shown in Figure 5. The 95% confidence intervals (CIs) shown in Figure 5 indicate that the DFA level indicating white noise (i.e., $DFA \sim 0.5$) falls within the CIs of the shuffled time series, but that this is not the case for the CIs of the empirical time series.

The difference between the mean DFA score for the shuffled and empirical time series was $M = 0.32$, which was significant ($t(12) = 17.29, p < .001$). We can therefore conclude that the observed SSE time series are closer to pink noise than would be expected if the time series were random, which supports Hypothesis 1.




FIGURE 5 Mean DFA scores and 95% CIs for SSE for empirical time series and for random (shuffled) time series. DFA ~ 0.5 = white noise and DFA ~ 1.0 = pink noise.

Association Between Temporal Structure of SSE (DFA) and Context-Independent Self-reported Measures

Self-Esteem

The average self-report SSE score was $M = 5.94$ ($SD = 1.65$), and the average self-report trait self-esteem score was $M = 4.03$ ($SD = 0.57$). The two measures of self-esteem were moderately correlated ($r = .36$). Neither of the static measures of self-esteem correlated significantly with the DFA values. For trait self-esteem, the correlation with DFA was $r = -.52$ ($p = .07$), and for SSE the correlation with DFA was $r = -.06$ ($p = .86$). The lack of significant correlations between DFA and static self-esteem measures indicates that the temporal structure of SSE variability is a distinct concept from the static levels of self-esteem, which is in support of Hypothesis 2.

Autonomy Levels

Table 2 presents the means and SDs of the self-reported autonomy levels of adolescents, as well as their correlation with the DFA scores.

The relationship between DFA scores and autonomy measures was positive, indicating that the higher the DFA values (i.e., the closer to pink noise), the higher the levels of autonomy. Correlations were small to moderate, however, and were not significant ($p > .05$), which is partly in support of Hypothesis 3.

TABLE 2 Means and SDs for self-report autonomy levels, and their correlation with the DFA values for the SSE time series

Autonomy variable	Mean	SD	Correlation with DFA
Child autonomy (average)	3.43	0.57	0.25
Child attitudinal autonomy	3.43	0.74	0.16
Child emotional autonomy	3.45	0.71	0.30
Child functional autonomy	3.41	0.57	0.16

Discussion

In this article, we argued that the common assumption regarding SSE (as contextually based error around a baseline level of trait self-esteem) does not fully reflect the temporal nature of SSE variability. We suggest that the coordination of SSE is predominantly determined by its own interaction dynamics, thereby producing structured and meaningful temporal variability across real time. Our argument is based on the fact that other human processes that are determined by such dynamics are ubiquitously found to exhibit structured noise, i.e., pink noise (Stanley et al., 1993).

We found that the variability of SSE across real time must indeed be characterized as (approaching) pink noise. Moreover, we show that this structure of variability is significantly different from the structure of variability that would be exhibited if SSE was characterized by random fluctuations with no carry-over effect from one moment to the next, i.e., white noise. This was in support of our main hypothesis (Hypothesis 1). In addition, we found that the temporal structure of SSE is a distinct concept from the valence level of (state and trait) self-esteem, which was in support of Hypothesis 2.

For Hypothesis 1, we explicitly tested the specific assumption that there is no carry-over effect from one moment to the next, which—if true—should result in random variability of SSE (i.e., white noise). Although it seems clear that the commonly adopted “barometer” approach to SSE corresponds with a white noise hypothesis, one may argue that this interpretation of the underlying assumption is too strict. Specifically, it may be argued that the “barometer” approach allows for the assumption that there is short-term carry-over effect across SSE, due to—for example—continuity in the immediate context. In this case, the time series would exhibit only short-term correlations that rapidly decay across time; or in other words, Brown noise (see Figure 1(c)). Although we did not explicitly test this alternative hypothesis, our finding was that SSE variability was close to pink noise, where the small deviations from pink noise were in the direction of white noise, and *not* in the direction of Brown noise (recall that Brown noise is at the opposite end of the noise spectrum from white noise, where pink noise lies between the two). It is therefore highly unlikely that there are only short-term carry-over effects across our SSE time-series.

The above results have significant theoretical and methodological implications. We show that the nature of SSE variability is less straightforward than was perhaps formerly assumed. Specifically, the presence of pink noise is indicative of a fractal process, which has underlying interaction-dominant dynamics. An important implication of this is that SSE is active, rather than passive, in that it self-coordinates by balancing between self-maintained stability and flexible adaptations to external influences.

Furthermore, the presence of pink noise in SSE fundamentally questions the appropriateness of single-scale measures of SSE. Such measures are static by nature, as they are limited to the measurement of SSE *levels* (Scheff & Fearon, 2004). However, if high-level psychometric concepts that are central to psychological theory—such as self-esteem—have a *dynamic* nature, this suggests that “behavior cannot be adequately measured with statistics based simply on mean and variance” (Lipsitz, 1992, p. 1807), and that measures are needed that also capture the level of “complexity” of these concepts, that is, the extent to which they reveal coupling of multiple components or of time scales. This is not to say that measures of mean and SD are not of value. Instead, our results call for a broader methodological approach to SSE, where both the magnitude *and* structure of SSE variability are meaningful, but distinct, characteristics to be studied.

In our study, all individuals’ SSE time series approached pink noise. Moreover, the participants in our study were all psychologically healthy and well-adapted adolescents.

This corresponds with the notion that pink noise is a signature of healthy, efficient, and well-coordinated behavior. Furthermore, our results showed that the level of pink noise was associated (albeit weakly) with adolescents' context-independent autonomy levels (a pivotal indicator of positive psychosocial adjustment during adolescence; Noom et al., 1999). Specifically, higher DFA scores (i.e., closer to pure pink noise) were associated with higher emotional, attitudinal, and functional autonomy scores, although the correlation was not significant. This was partially in support of Hypothesis 3. Future research is needed to explore which psychological concepts are highly associated with the temporal structure of variability in order to provide more clarification regarding its psychological meaning.

A few important limitations of this study warrant noting. First, as there were no large deviations from pink noise in our sample, it is only possible for us to speculate about what deviations from pink noise might mean for SSE. Previous research shows that deviations toward white or Brown noise indicate unhealthy systems (e.g., Gilden & Hancock, 2007). Therefore, it is likely that deviations in the context of SSE would be indicative of maladaptive self-esteem; where deviations toward white noise indicate overly flexible SSE and deviations toward Brown noise indicate overly rigid SSE. While past research has focused on maladaptive self-esteem as being low (e.g., Robson, 1988), unstable (based on the magnitude of the SD; e.g., Kernis, 2005), and fragile (e.g., Zeigler-Hill, 2006), it is plausible that the temporal structure of SSE may also be an important tool for identifying individuals with maladaptive SSE. To explore this possibility, future research is needed regarding the temporal structure of SSE in more heterogeneous samples, or in clinical samples.

A second limitation of this study is that our sample does not include age groups other than adolescents, which means that it may not be possible to generalize our findings to other age groups. The adolescent period can be characterized as "unstable" regarding self-esteem, where adolescents demonstrate a dip in the average valence of self-esteem (Robins et al., 2002) as well as relatively low test-retest correlations of self-esteem (Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2003). Future research is therefore necessary in order to investigate whether SSE variability is more structured (i.e., with smaller deviations from pink noise) in adults than in adolescents, and more generally, whether the temporal structure of SSE differs on average across the life span.

Third, it was beyond the scope of this article to explore the temporal dynamics that occur in the interaction between the parent and the child, and how these dynamics relate to the temporal dynamics of SSE. Future research is needed in order to investigate how the two are related.

In summary, while the general level of SSE variability is regarded as meaningful (Kernis et al., 1993), our findings show that the temporal *structure* of SSE variability has been unnecessarily disregarded (as "random") in empirical studies of SSE. Our results bring the passive and random nature of SSE into question, and provide evidence that SSE, as a real-time process, might be better conceptualized as an intrinsically dynamic and active process. This is an important shift in the theoretical conceptualization of the nature of SSE. Based on our findings, we call for a broader methodological approach to SSE, where measures of complexity are combined with measures of central tendencies (SD and means). We hope that these theoretical and empirical implications will be further explored in future research.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes

1. Pink noise has been found in human processes such as word naming (Van Orden et al., 2003; Wijnants et al., 2012), finger tapping (Gilden, Thornton, & Mallon, 1995), walking (Hausdorff et al., 1995), standing (Duarte & Zatsiorsky, 2000), rhythmical aiming (Wijnants et al., 2012), neuromagnetic activity (Linkenkaer-Hansen et al., 2005), and mental-rotation tasks (Gilden & Hancock, 2007).
2. Note that this refers to general autonomy levels as measured with questionnaires, and not to autonomous behavior expressed during the parent–adolescent interactions.
3. The autonomy scale is not symmetrical as there were more categories for autonomous behavior than for heteronomous behavior.

References

- Alessandri, G., & Caprara, G. (2012). A unified latent curve, latent state-trait analysis of the developmental trajectories and correlates of positive orientation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 47, 341–368. doi:10.1080/00273171.2012.673954
- Allen, J., Hauser, S., Bell, K., & O'Connor, T. (1994). Longitudinal assessment of autonomy and relatedness in adolescent-family interactions as predictors of adolescent ego development and self-esteem. *Child Development*, 65, 179–194. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.1994.tb00743.x
- Atkinson, J. W. (1964). *An introduction to motivation*. Oxford: Van Nostrand.
- Bulanda, R., & Majumdar, D. (2008). Perceived parent–child relations and adolescent self-esteem. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 18, 203–212. doi:10.1007/s10826-008-9220-3
- Butner, J., Pasupathi, M., & Vallejos, V. (2008). When the facts just don't add up: Fractal nature of conversational stories. *Social Cognition*, 26, 670–699. doi:10.1521/soco.2008.26.6.670
- Coan, J. A., & Gottman, J. M. (2007). The specific affect coding system (SPAFF). In J. A. Coan & J. J. B. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of emotion elicitation and assessment. Series in affective science* (pp. 267–285). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Correll, J. (2008). 1/F noise and effort on implicit measures of bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94, 48–59. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.48
- Cunningham, W., & Zelazo, P. (2007). Attitudes and evaluations: A social cognitive neuroscience perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 97–104. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2006.12.005
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. A. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Vol. 38, perspectives on motivation* (pp. 237–288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1995). Human autonomy: The basis for true self-esteem. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 31–49). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- DeHart, T., & Pelham, B. (2007). Fluctuations in state implicit self-esteem in response to daily negative events. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 157–165. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2006.01.002
- Delignières, D., Fortes, M., & Ninot, G. (2004). The fractal dynamics of self-esteem and physical self. *Nonlinear Dynamics in Psychology and Life Sciences*, 8, 479–510.
- Denissen, J., Penke, L., Schmitt, D., & Van Aken, M. (2008). Self-esteem reactions to social interactions: Evidence for sociometer mechanisms across days, people, and nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 181–196. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.181
- DiDonato, M. D., England, D., Martin, C. L., & Amazeen, P. G. (2013). Dynamical analyses for developmental science: A primer for intrigued scientists. *Human Development*, 56, 59–75. doi:10.1159/000342936
- Diniz, A., Wijnants, M. L., Torre, K., Barreiros, J., Crato, N., Bosman, A. M. T., ... Delignières, D. (2011). Contemporary theories of 1/f noise in motor control. *Human Movement Science*, 30, 889–905. doi:10.1016/j.humov.2010.07.006
- Donnellan, M. B., Kenny, D. a, Trzesniewski, K. H., Lucas, R. E., & Conger, R. D. (2012). Using trait-state models to evaluate the longitudinal consistency of global self-esteem from

- adolescence to adulthood. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*, 634–645. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2012.07.005
- Duarte, M., & Zatsiorsky, V. M. (2000). On the fractal properties of natural human standing. *Neuroscience Letters*, *283*, 173–176. doi:10.1016/S0304-3940(00)00960-5
- Epstein, S. (1993). Implications of cognitive-experiential self-theory for personality and developmental psychology. In D. C. Funder, R. D. Parke, C. Tomlinson-Keasey, & K. Widaman (Eds.), *Studying lives through time: Personality and development* (pp. 399–438). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10127-033
- Epstein, S., & Morling, B. (1995). Is the self motivated to do more than enhance and/or verify itself? In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem* (pp. 9–29). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Fogel, A. (1993). *Developing through relationships*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fortes, M., Delignières, D., & Ninot, G. (2004). The dynamics of self-esteem and physical self: between preservation and adaptation. *Quality and Quantity*, *38*, 735–751. doi:10.1007/s11135-004-4764-9
- Franck, E., & De Raedt, R. (2007). Self-esteem reconsidered: Unstable self-esteem outperforms level of self-esteem as vulnerability marker for depression. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *45*, 1531–1541. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2007.01.003
- Frijda, N. H. (2001). The self and emotions. In H. A. Bosma & S. Kunnen (Eds.), *Identity and emotion: Development through self-organization* (pp. 39–63). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Gable, S., Gosnell, C., & Prok, T. (2012). Close relationships. In M. Mehl & T. Conner (Eds.), *Handbook of Research Methods for Studying Daily Life* (pp. 511–524). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Gilden, D. L. (2001). Cognitive emissions of $1/f$ noise. *Psychological Review*, *108*, 33–56. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.108.1.33
- Gilden, D. L., & Hancock, H. (2007). Response variability in attention-deficit disorders. *Psychological Science*, *18*, 796–802. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01982.x
- Gilden, D. L., Thornton, T., & Mallon, M. W. (1995). $1/f$ noise in human cognition. *Science*, *267*, 1837–1839.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York, NY: Aldine.
- Gottschalk, A., Bauer, M. S., & Peter, C. (1995). Evidence of chaotic variation in bipolar disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *52*, 947–959. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1995.03950230061009
- Granic, I., Hollenstein, T., Dishion, T. J., & Patterson, G. R. (2003). Longitudinal analysis of flexibility and reorganization in early adolescence: A dynamic systems study of family interactions. *Developmental Psychology*, *39*, 606–617. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.39.3.606
- Harter, S., & Whitesell, N. R. (2003). Beyond the debate: Why some adolescents report stable self-worth over time and situation, whereas others report changes in self-worth. *Journal of Personality*, *71*, 1027–1058. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.7106006
- Hasselmann, F. (2013). When the blind curve is finite: Dimension estimation and model inference based on empirical waveforms. *Frontiers in Physiology*, *4*, 1–4. doi:10.3389/fphys.2013.00075
- Hausdorff, J. M. (2009). Gait dynamics in Parkinson's disease: Common and distinct behavior among stride length, gait variability, and fractal-like scaling. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, *19*, 026113. doi:10.1063/1.3147408
- Hausdorff, J. M., Peng, C., Ladin, Z., Wei, J., & Goldberger, A. (1995). Is walking a random walk? Evidence for long-range correlations in stride interval of human gait. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, *78*, 349–358.
- Heatherton, T., & Polivy, J. (1991). Development and validation of a scale for measuring state self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 895–910. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.60.6.895
- Heppner, W., Kernis, M., Nezelek, J., Foster, J., Lakey, C., & Goldman, B. (2008). Within-person relationships among daily self-esteem, need satisfaction, and authenticity. *Psychological*

- Science: A Journal of the American Psychological Society/APS*, 19, 1140–1145. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02215.x
- Herman, T., Giladi, N., Gurevich, T., & Hausdorff, J. M. (2005). Gait instability and fractal dynamics of older adults with a cautious gait: Why do certain older adults walk fearfully? *Gait and Posture*, 21, 178–185. doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2004.01.014
- Jordan, C. H., Whitfield, M., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2007). Intuition and the correspondence between implicit and explicit self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 1067–1079. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.1067
- Kernis, M. (2003). Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14(1), 1–26. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1401_01
- Kernis, M. (2005). Measuring self-esteem in context: The importance of stability of self-esteem in psychological functioning. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 1569–1605. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00359.x
- Kernis, M., Cornell, D., Sun, C., Berry, A., & Harlow, T. (1993). There's more to self-esteem than whether it is high or low: The importance of stability of self-esteem. *Personality Processes and Individual Differences*, 65, 1190–1204. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1190
- Kernis, M., Grannemann, B., & Barclay, L. (1989). Stability and level of self-esteem as predictors of anger arousal and hostility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 1013–1022. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.56.6.1013
- Kernis, M., & Paradise, A. (2002). Distinguishing between secure and fragile forms of high self-esteem. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-determination Research* (pp. 339–360). New York, NY: The University of Rochester Press.
- Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2006). Family conflict communication. In J. G. Oetzel & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Communication. Integrating Theory, Research, and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Koole, S. L., Dijksterhuis, A., & Van Knippenberg, A. (2001). What's in a name: Implicit self-esteem and the automatic self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 669–685. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.80.4.669
- Kroger, J. (1998). Adolescence as a second separation-individuation process: Critical review of an object relations approach. In E. E. Skoe & A. L. Von der Lippe (Eds.), *Personality development in adolescence: A cross national and life span perspective* (pp. 172–192). London: Routledge.
- Leary, M. R. (1999). Making sense of self-esteem. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 8, 32–35. doi:10.1111/1467-8721.00008
- Leary, M. R. (2004). *The curse of the self: Self-awareness, egotism, and the quality of human life*. Oxford: University Press.
- Leary, M. R., & Downs, D. (1995). Interpersonal functions of the self-esteem motive. In M. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, Agency and Self-esteem* (pp. 123–144). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., Downs, D. L., Denissen, J., Penke, L., . . . Van Aken, M. (1995). *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 518–530. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.68.3.518
- Linkenkaer-Hansen, K., Monto, S., Rytsälä, H., Suominen, K., Isometsä, E., & Kähkönen, S. (2005). Breakdown of long-range temporal correlations in theta oscillations in patients with major depressive disorder. *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience*, 25, 10131–10137. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.3244-05.2005
- Lipsitz, L. A. (1992). Loss of complexity and aging. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 267, 1806–1809. doi:10.1001/jama.1992.03480130122036
- Lord, F., & Novick, M. (1968). *Statistical theories of mental test scores*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Murray, S., Griffin, D., Rose, P., & Bellavia, G. (2003). Calibrating the sociometer: The relational contingencies of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 63–84. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.1.63
- Ninot, G., Fortes, M., & Delignières, D. (2001). A psychometric tool for the assessment of the dynamics of the physical self. *European Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51, 205–216.

- Ninot, G., Fortes, M., & Delignières, D. (2005). The dynamics of self-esteem in adults over a 6-month period: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Psychology, 139*, 315–330. doi:10.3200/JRLP.139.4.315-330
- Noom, M., Dekovic, M., & Meeus, W. (1999). Autonomy, attachment and psychosocial adjustment during adolescence: A double-edged sword? *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 771–783. doi:10.1006/jado.1999.0269
- Noom, M., Dekovic, M., & Meeus, W. (2001). Conceptual analysis and measurement of adolescent autonomy. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 30*, 577–595. doi:0047-2891/01/1000-0577
- Oosterwegel, A., Field, N., Hart, D., & Anderson, K. (2001). The relation of self-esteem variability to emotion variability, mood, personality traits, and depressive tendencies. *Journal of Personality, 69*, 689–708. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.695160
- Peng, C.-K., Havlin, S., Stanley, H. E., & Goldberger, A. (1995). Quantification of scaling exponents and crossover phenomena in nonstationary heartbeat time series. *American Institute for Physics, 5*, 82–87. doi:10.1063/1.166141
- Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K. H., Tracy, J. L., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2002). Global self-esteem across the life span. *Psychology and Aging, 17*, 423–434. doi:10.1037//0882-7974.17.3.423
- Robson, P. J. (1988). Self-esteem—a psychiatric view. *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 153*, 6–15. doi:10.1192/bjp.153.1.6
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the Self*. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger.
- Rosenberg, M. (1986). Self-concept from middle childhood through adolescence. In J. Suls & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 3, pp. 107–135). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ryan, R. M., & Brown, K. W. (2003). Why we don't need self-esteem: On fundamental needs, contingent love, and mindfulness. *Psychological Inquiry, 14*, 71–76.
- Savin-Williams, R. C., & Demo, D. H. (1983). Situational and transitional determinants of adolescent self-feelings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44*, 824–833. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.44.4.824
- Savin-Williams, R. C., & Jaquish, G. A. (1981). The assessment of adolescent self-esteem: A comparison of methods. *Journal of Personality, 49*(3). doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1981.tb00940.x
- Scheff, T. J., & Fearon, D. S. (2004). Cognition and emotion? The dead end in self-esteem research. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 34*, 73–90. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.2004.00235.x
- Segev, M., Soljačić, M., & Dudley, J. M. (2012). Fractal optics and beyond. *Nature Photonics, 6*, 209–210. doi:10.1038/nphoton.2012.71
- Stadnitski, T. (2012). Measuring fractality. *Frontiers in Physiology, 3*, 127. doi:10.3389/fphys.2012.00127
- Stanley, H. E., Buldyrev, S. V., Goldberger, A. L., Havlin, S., Peng, C.-K., & Simons, M. (1993). Long-range power-law correlations in condensed matter physics and biophysics. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications, 200*, 4–24. doi:10.1016/0378-4371(93)90500-4
- Stipek, D., Recchia, S., McClintic, S., & Lewis, M. D. (1992). Self evaluation in young children. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 57*(1). doi:10.2307/1166190
- Tangney, J., & Fischer, K. (1995). Self-conscious emotions and the affect revolution: Framework and overview. In *Self-conscious emotions: The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 3–22). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Thomaes, S., Reijntjes, A., Orobio de Castro, B., Bushman, B., Poorthuis, A., & Telch, M. (2010). I like me if you like me: On the interpersonal modulation and regulation of preadolescents' state self-esteem. *Child Development, 81*, 811–825. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01435.x
- Trzesniewski, K. H., Donnellan, M. B., & Robins, R. W. (2003). Stability of self-esteem across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 205–220. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.205
- Vallacher, R. R., Nowak, A., Froehlich, M., & Rockloff, M. (2002). The dynamics of self-evaluation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*, 370–379. doi:10.1207/S15327957PSPR0604_11

- Van Geert, P., & Van Dijk, M. (2002). Focus on variability: New tools to study intra-individual variability in developmental data. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 25, 340–374. doi:10.1016/S0163-6383(02)00140-6
- Van Orden, G., Holden, J., & Turvey, M. (2003). Self-organization of cognitive performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 132, 331–350. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.132.3.331
- Van Orden, G., Holden, J., & Turvey, M. (2005). Human cognition and $1/f$ scaling. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 134, 117–123. doi:10.1037/0096-3445.134.1.117
- Wijnants, M. L. (2014). A review of theoretical perspectives in cognitive science on the presence of $1/f$ scaling in coordinated physiological and cognitive processes. *Journal of Nonlinear Dynamics*. doi:10.1155/2014/962043
- Wijnants, M. L., Cox, R. F. a, Hasselman, F., Bosman, A. M. T., & Van Orden, G. (2012). A trade-off study revealing nested timescales of constraint. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 3, 116. doi:10.3389/fphys.2012.00116
- Wijnants, M. L., Hasselman, F., Cox, R. F. A., Bosman, A. M. T., & Van Orden, G. (2012). An interaction-dominant perspective on reading fluency and dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 62, 100–119. doi:10.1007/s11881-012-0067-3
- Wong, A. E., Vallacher, R. R., & Nowak, A. (2014). Fractal dynamics in self-evaluation reveal self-concept clarity. *Nonlinear Dynamics, Psychology, and Life Sciences*, 18, 349–369.
- Zeigler-Hill, V. (2006). Discrepancies between implicit and explicit self-esteem: Implications for narcissism and self-esteem instability. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 119–144. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00371.x